THEOLOGY

VOL. LVII NOVEMBER, 1954 No. 413

Editorial Notes

THE slender volume which contains Professor S. L. Greenslade's Frederick Denison Maurice lectures is a notable contribution to the understanding of the relations of Church and State. (Its title is *Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius*, S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d.) A survey of their relations during the brief but eventful period indicated in the title shows how ill-founded and misleading are all doctrinaire types of theory. "Theory arose from the concrete situations of history, and it may be a proper conclusion that it will always be so, or at least that the actual relation between Church and State will always be fluid, and the application of theory difficult. Perhaps we shall have to go further and say that the principles themselves are strangely elusive" (p. 79). These wise words, and still more the historical facts which provoked them, should be pondered at a time when it seems to be supposed that a formula like "Let the Church be the Church!" is one that admits of luminously clear application.

* * * * *

The Student's New Testament, by E. J. Goodspeed (C.U.P. for University of Chicago Press, 56s. 6d.), is a stout volume of 1,055 pages, containing on opposite pages Westcott and Hort's Greek text and Dr Goodspeed's American translation. The latter was first published in 1923 and has justly won recognition as one of the best translations into modern, everyday English. The Greek type is large and clear, and there will be obvious advantages to future purchasers of the Greek Testament in getting this edition if they can afford it. A new edition of the Authorized Version, edited by John Sterling with drawings by Horace Knowles, has been published by the British and Foreign Bible Society (7s. 6d. and 15s.) to commemorate its third jubilee. The text is complete, but a smaller type is used for some sections (chiefly in the Pentateuch) that are of less interest to the ordinary Bible reader. The text is printed in paragraphs with subheadings to indicate the course of the story. Most attractive is the imaginative and extensive scheme of black-and-white illustrations. Those of us who can recall the old-fashioned illustrated Bibles on which we were brought up, and which held much fascination for children, ought to welcome an edition which has their virtues without their crudities.

* * * * *

The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, by G. Ernest Wright (S.C.M. Press, 7s.), is a monograph of 176 pages, published in the series of "Ecumenical Biblical Studies" for the Study Department of

the World Council of Churches. It is the outcome of group work by a number of scholars in the neighbourhood of Chicago. While it is a judicious introduction to the subject that takes into account much recent research in the field of biblical studies, Professor Wright would probably have written in a livelier manner if he had been left to his own resources and had not been, as it were, the mouthpiece of a group.

* * * * *

Professor Roger Aubert's *La théologie catholique au milieu du XX^e siècle* (Casterman, Tournai, 39 frs) is a brief but interesting survey of the tendencies that have characterized Roman Catholic theology during the last decade or two, in France and Belgium especially and also in Germany. Contemporary theology is considered to have two principal preoccupations—a return to its sources and an openness to the modern world. The chapter headings indicate how this theme is worked out: "Le renouveau biblique", "Les renouveaux liturgique et patristique", "Ouverture au monde moderne", and "Face à l'existentialisme et à l'œcuménisme". There are useful pointers to theological writings which illustrate these tendencies.

* * * * *

Morale chrétienne et requêtes contemporaines (Casterman, Tournai, 90 frs) is a symposium, made up of a series of papers prepared for a conference. It shows that a wholesome fermentation is at work in Roman Catholic moral theology, from which other denominations might profit. It is pointed out that the so-called treatises of classical moral theology (on which some Anglicans have been inclined to depend) date only from about the sixteenth century, and that there is no reason for regarding them as the only or final expression of Christian moral teaching. In fact, they are now in many ways unsatisfactory or outmoded. They presuppose a closed Christian society; they are too rationalistic; they are based on a separation between ethics and spirituality; they are not rooted in the faith of the New Testament. It is therefore suggested that the second half of the twentieth century has before it the important task of renewing or revising the received moral theology. The present volume is in the nature of prolegomena to such an enterprise, or an indication of the various data that will have to be taken into account. Part I contains essays on the moral teaching of the N.T. compared with that of the Greeks. Part II points out the fresh insights which (*a*) psychology and (*b*) sociology have to contribute to a contemporary moral theology. Part III deals with present philosophical movements, concentrating on the thought of Jaspers and Sartre. Part IV attempts an eirenic and suitably inconclusive confrontation between existentialism and thomism. We would direct the attention of all who are responsible for teaching moral theology in the Church of England to this book.

* * * * *

A number of further liturgical texts has come from South India.

They show how the Church there is developing. *The Lord's Supper or the Holy Eucharist* (O.U.P., 1s. 3d.) is the eucharistic liturgy of the C.S.I., which was authorized for optional use in 1950 and now, after slight revision, has been approved "for general use wherever it is desired". The most important theological consideration of the rite that has yet appeared is Mr T. S. Garrett's *The Liturgy of the Church of South India: an introduction and commentary* (O.U.P., 3s. 6d.). *The Liturgy of the Church of South India with notes* (C.L.S. Press, Bangalore, n.p.) contains the liturgy with notes as used in St Mark's Cathedral, Bangalore, and is really a communicants' manual. *Bible readings and Collects for Sundays and other special days, with proper prefaces* (O.U.P., 1s. 6d.) contains proper collects, O.T. lessons, epistles and gospels, authorized for experimental use at the eucharist throughout the Christian year. They are for the most part derived from traditional sources, chiefly the Book of Common Prayer. A striking feature is the provision of a title for each Sunday which points to the theme or common subject-matter of the collect and lections for the day: e.g., "Twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost. *The Wretchedness and Greatness of the Church.* Collect (as for 22nd Sunday after Trinity in B.C.P.). Amos 3. 1 f. 1 Cor. 3. 10–17. Mark 8. 27–35." *Daily Bible Readings: a draft prepared by the Synod Liturgy Committee of the Church of South India* (O.U.P., 2s.) is a lectionary containing passages from the O.T. and the N.T. for use at morning and evening prayer throughout the year or for private use. Here too the provision of titles indicating the subject-matter of each lection is an attractive feature, as is also perhaps the fact that the lections are as a rule shorter than those to which Anglicans are accustomed on weekdays. "Except for stories which cannot well be broken up, the selected passages are short, so as to make a clear impression on the mind and to be easily recalled."

* * * * *

During recent years we have received several books which taken together contain much useful and much curious enlightenment about religious bodies on the other side of the Atlantic. *The Religious Bodies of America,* by F. E. Mayer (Concordia Publishing House, Saint Louis, Missouri, n.p.) is a volume of nearly 600 pages and it supplies a mass of carefully arranged information about the numerous denominations that exist in the U.S.A. It has been prepared under the auspices of the Missouri-Lutheran Synod, but it will be widely used as a work of reference, and deservedly so. There is an account of the history as well as of the doctrinal system of each denomination. *The Small Sects of America,* by Elmer T. Clark (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $3.00), deals with the very large number of small sects as distinguished from the major denominations. The sects are classified as follows: (i) Pessimistic or Adventist; (ii) Perfectionist or Subjectivist; (iii) Charismatic or Pentecostal; (iv) Communistic; and (v) Legalistic or Objectivist. *The Province of the Pacific,* by L. C. Sanford (Church Historical Society, Philadelphia, $3.00), is a history of the founding and building of a Province of the

American Episcopal Church on the Pacific Coast. The province comprises the following dioceses and missionary districts: Alaska, Arizona California, Eastern Oregon, Honolulu, Idaho, Los Angeles, Nevada, Olympia, Oregon, Philippine Is., Sacramento, San Joaquin, Spokane, and Utah. *Church and Sect in Canada*, by S. D. Clark (O.U.P. for University of Toronto Press, 26s.), is the work of a Canadian sociologist, and is concerned with the non-theological factors in religious division. It is an interesting study of the developments in Canadian Protestantism from 1760 to 1900. Dr Clark maintains that the church and sect forms of religious organization (in Troeltsch's sense) are closely related to conditions of social stability and disorder. This is a book that belongs to the same class as H. Richard Niebuhr's *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, and some useful work might be done on similar lines with regard to British religious history.

Minneapolis and Evanston

THE Editor asked me to write, not a description, but a "theological assessment" of the conferences at Minneapolis and Evanston. Will it really have been worth while, he asked, to assemble all these Anglicans at Minneapolis, or could their time and energy have been better employed? As I waited for the plane on my way, I wrote in my diary certain further questions. Would the two conferences serve to strengthen the sense of the Church as a world community, both for our own members at Minneapolis and with members of other confessions at Evanston? Would we be conscious of any special message from the Younger Churches? In what ways would the conferences interpret the role of the laity in the Church? Would Evanston preserve the position of the first assembly at Amsterdam, that the whole world, capitalist and communist, is under the judgment of God and under his mercy; or should we be under a stronger pressure to-day in America to align the Christian forces with the democracy of the West in a crusade against communism? Would the Main Theme at Evanston, the Christian Hope, be interpreted in terms of a realized or a futurist eschatology?

On the issue of communism, while we were no doubt conscious of a certain nervousness around us, I should say that the balanced judgment of Amsterdam was certainly preserved. One of the clearest statements came in an outstanding address by Dag Hammerskjold, the Secretary-General of the United Nations. "Let us not get caught in the belief that divisions of our world between the righteous and the wrongdoers, between idealism and materialism, between freedom and slavery, coincide with national boundaries. . . . Those whose only ideal is material well-being meet us in every country, as those whose ideal is self-less service." Amid the tensions of the world, with which he of all men must be daily concerned, he spoke the encouraging word, "He who fears God will no longer fear men." In an address which stripped the veil of religious language to look at religious

realities, Dr Hromadka gave the warning, "A godless world is much less dangerous than a paganized Christian Church." Dr Reinhold Niebuhr unfortunately could not attend; but in a paper for Evanston he wrote similarly, "It is not only those who deny God, but those who profess him but claim him too simply as an ally of their purposes and as an aid for their ambitions, who bring evil into the world."

The discussion on the Main Theme at Evanston was a little curious. It almost seemed that everyone could speak clearly about the Christian Hope, except when they were commissioned to do so. Of all the preliminary reports prepared for Evanston, the one on the Main Theme received the most severe treatment by the groups which studied it; and the statement from these groups in turn was severely questioned in the debate in Plenary Session. The preliminary document left a general impression that the theologians had been discussing the nature of hope with one another, rather than addressing a word of hope to the need of the world, in terms which those in need would understand. Lest any should say that this is not the business of the theologians, as we recover a biblical theology let us remember the warning of Ezekiel, Should not the shepherds feed the sheep? The Evanston statement commented on the preliminary document, "We find that the note of joyous affirmation of the Christian Hope does not sufficiently illuminate the Report." This Evanston statement itself was a little clearer, but still contained the phrase, "We are not agreed on the relationship between the Christian Hope here and now, and his ultimate hope." As a theological statement on the diversities of views, this no doubt was true; but it was not surprising that the *Chicago Tribune* carried next day a slightly impatient headline, "World Council of Churches remains split on chief issue."

Meanwhile however other sections, which were concerned with the distress of the world in international affairs, in race tensions, amid mass poverty or refugees, had been preparing their statements. When the final documents are published, it should be possible to select from these other statements an anthology of quotations on the Christian Hope, far more clear and strong than the documents dealing directly with the Christian Hope. The Report of Section IV on International Affairs says for instance: "Our confidence lies not in our own reason or strength, but in the power that comes from God. . . . The fruit of our effort rests in his hands. We can therefore live and work as those who know that God reigns, undaunted by all the arrogant pretensions of evil, ready to face situations that seem hopeless and yet to act in them as men whose hope is indestructible." Section II on Evangelism stated: "We were hopeless in our suffering and distress; we have seen our affliction turned into blessing by his grace and used for the furtherance of his glory. We were hopeless about the final outcome of the human story, in distress about the futility of our own efforts; Christ has given us hope. We were hopeless in face of death, trembling between the fear of annihilation and the fear of future punishment, but Christ having overcome the sharp-

ness of death has opened to us the gates of the Kingdom." The Message of Evanston says in its final words: "We do not know what is coming to us. But we know who is coming. It is he who meets us every day and who will meet us at the end—Jesus Christ our Lord. Therefore we say to you: Rejoice in hope." In these statements there is a proper balance between the ultimate hope in Christ beyond this world and the present hope that we live already in a world of which he said, "If I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the Kingdom of God is come upon you." In technical terms, the "realized eschatology" of the Kingdom present in Christ gives us assurance of the "futurist eschatology" of his ultimate reign in glory, and therein also lifts us to new hope in an "imminent eschatology", that here in our day he comes in power to overthrow the forces of evil.

We may well pause and ask why these statements, which deal with the distress of the world, seem to speak more clearly of the Christian Hope than does the statement dealing directly with the theology of the Christian Hope. Partly no doubt the answer is that we should not expect to define our hope in clear terms. St Paul after all made plain the obvious point: "Hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?" By its very nature hope looks forward from the distress of a world we know all too well toward the deliverance we do not yet see. Yet also it may perhaps be one of the lessons of Evanston, that we learn most about the theology of Christian Hope, not when we theorize about it, but rather when in action we take the message of the Love of Christ out into every sphere of life where as yet that Love is unknown. To say that hope is of necessity existential is perhaps a little dangerous, since that has become one of those Humpty Dumpty words, which everyone uses in a different way. In simpler terms perhaps we should recognize that it is true of eschatology, as of other branches of theology, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine."

The report on the Main Theme commends the earlier document to the Churches for further study; and that it certainly both deserves and needs. Do we, or do we not, believe in a literal Second Coming, which would mean the end of this whole world as we know it? Ought we as Christians to feel a responsibility for the future of the human race on earth, for instance over food and population, it may be for centuries ahead? Would such concern be a mature responsibility under God, or the denial that at any moment God may bring this whole present world to an end? When Jesus spoke of the coming of the Son of Man, did he mean his own return as an individual, or did he mean the reign of God in the community of the saints of the Most High, as in the book of Daniel? What is the relationship of the Kingdom of God to the gift of the Holy Spirit, and in turn to the Church? Is the clue perhaps that we have lost the Biblical faith in the livingness of God, and have thought of his Kingdom in too static terms? If we recovered a truly Biblical faith, should we see that it belongs of necessity to the living Christ, to be both present in his world in dynamic power, yet waiting also at each moment to reveal himself in further power? These are questions which Evanston

raised, if it did not answer; and they require attention with a scholarship that is both historical and related to the need of the world.

From these issues of eschatology let me turn to another of our opening questions, the sense of the Church as a world community. There we might say that Minneapolis and Evanston provided each in their different way a realized ecclesiology. Theories about the World Church became a living experience of the Church, as we met from many different backgrounds and found our fellowship in Christ.

If I were to use one word to describe Minneapolis, I should use the word eirenic. I think most delegates would agree how deeply we were conscious of the contributions of the Catholic and Evangelical traditions in our Church, and how little we were conscious of any opposition between them. In this the Congress probably represents a growing and most welcome trend to-day. Many of the laity are heartily weary of anything that savours of party spirit or faction in our theological training or press or in the general life of the Church; amongst the clergy there is a greater readiness to look for the best and learn from the best in a churchmanship other than their own. Minneapolis will certainly have justified the expenditure of time and energy, if it both expresses and therein strengthens this eirenic spirit. It should be said also that it was all to the good that the conference was held elsewhere than on English soil. The attitude of some people in England before the Congress seemed sometimes a little grudging. As in the political field we cannot help looking back at times with a slightly nostalgic longing on our own past days of power, and looking out with a slight uneasiness born of envy toward those whose prosperity now seems to exceed our own, so in religion we may recognize the fact of the Anglican Church in other lands, yet feel in some unconscious place in our hearts that we are really and truly the Church of England, and that everyone else ought to come to us, if there are ever lessons to be learnt. It is well that any such thoughts should be brought into the open, so that they may be at once both exposed and rejected. They are quite unrealist on any present view of the world, as they are quite untrue in any vision of Christ as Lord of his Church throughout the world. We from our Church in England have much to give, but also much to learn from the younger life of our Church overseas; we shall only give and only learn, if we are prepared to spend time and energy and funds to send clergy and laity from our dioceses here to meetings of the Church in other lands.

At Evanston the sense of fellowship was inevitably a little more difficult and a little less close than amid our own communion at Minneapolis. In part this was due to the greater size; numbers were larger, indeed too large for intimate fellowship and debate. The Second Assembly attempted two tasks, both of them urgent yet very difficult to combine, the actual study and planning of work within the World Council, and the education and publicity through which the ecumenical movement may be extended throughout the wider life of the Church. For the next Assembly it will be necessary to distinguish these two tasks, and to decide which is to have the priority.

Possibly the solution might be to hold a first week for delegates only for the work of the Assembly, since it is very difficult to undertake routine business with several thousand people looking on, nor is such business always good publicity. Then in a second week with the aid of the delegates and secretariat a wider conference might be held for education; and in such conference visitors could themselves be given a share in group discussion, so that they might be encouraged to make their own responsible contribution in the ecumenical movement.

Whatever the difficulties, it is the great achievement of the World Council of Churches that it has now created a quality of fellowship, in which people of very different outlook can meet and speak the truth in love to one another. Here again it was most certainly worth the expenditure of time and energy that a member of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa and an African could meet on one platform and explain their varied feelings about racial issues; that Christians from behind the Iron Curtain could meet on one platform with Christians from America or Britain; that Orthodox and Anglican, Free Church and Salvation Army, could meet in common loyalty to the One Christ whom they all serve.

At the outset of the Assembly, the General Secretary, Dr Visser 't Hooft, asked whether too much was attempted at Amsterdam, and whether it would prove that the World Council of Churches had lost momentum. It was a necessary question, because there could well have been a reaction from the enthusiasm with which the first foundation of the World Council was greeted at Amsterdam. As the Second Assembly becomes known in the life of the Churches, there is little doubt that it will prove to have gained, not lost, momentum. In his sermon at the opening service, Bishop Oxnam took up and repeated the theme from Amsterdam, "We intend to stay together." The Message accepted at the close of the Assembly declared, "We enter now upon a second stage. To stay together is not enough. We must go forward together. As we learn more of our unity in Christ, it becomes the more intolerable that we should be divided."

If those who came from earlier confessional conferences found that the fellowship was a little less intimate at Evanston, that must be regarded as both a fact and a challenge. What one speaker said of the divisions of race is true also of our divisions as churches; "the barriers we erect against others become the prison bars to our own souls". In this whole field of ecumenical relations Evanston will have moved forward in its recognition of the step that had already come at Lund, namely the shift of emphasis from ecclesiology to Christology. No doubt it was necessary first to study our different doctrines of the Church and Ministry; yet, as one Indian speaker said, such study seemed to reach an impasse. Studying our differences, we discovered, which was not surprising, that we are different. When we turn our study toward the One Christ, and still more when we join with him in his prayer that they may all be one, that the world may believe, then we may find, as Bishop Nygren said, that "the way to the centre is also the way to union". In this connexion we may notice

too the important statement on the Lambeth Quadrilateral by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his opening sermon at Minneapolis. He suggested that the Lambeth Formula had been analysed and dissected, and used as a qualifying test; that we should rather regard Word and Sacraments and Ministry as gifts from Christ to lead his Church into freedom and truth; that no Church uses these gifts fully as he would have us do, and that we should therefore learn from one another how he would have us use them.

In that task the so-called Older and Younger Churches will aid one another. It was noticeable at both conferences, as at the earlier Willingen Conference of the International Missionary Council, that the Younger Churches felt a more imperative need for the unity of the Church for the sake of its mission in a non-Christian environment. As the older Churches in Europe and America recognize the fact that they also have a mission toward their own non-Christian environment, they in their turn may realize that the Church is weak in evangelism just because it is weak in unity. At Amsterdam and at the last Lambeth Conference we all felt the vigour and maturity of leadership in the Younger Churches. At Minneapolis and at Evanston we still felt this vigour, yet were scarcely aware of a difference between speakers from Europe or Africa or the East. We have come to question the terms Younger and Older Churches, yet have found no substitute; and that perhaps is right, since from now on we should think of a single Church at work with the same commission and the same tasks in every land.

In these same tasks clergy and laity will aid one another in a single fellowship. At both conferences attention was given to the Christian home; and it was recognized that the Church itself has not always done its part, by encouraging members of different sex and age to worship and work together. In small practical ways the Church of England has much to learn from the Episcopal Church in America, in the various facilities which are provided to make it possible for the whole family to come to church together. Yet also, as both conferences recognized, "work for the church is not necessarily the only form of church work". Far more attention needs to be given, certainly, to the opportunities and responsibilities of lay people through their various professions to witness for Christ and to lead others to Christ. At the same time more help and training also need to be given as to how the varied work of the world may become not only an opportunity for Christian witness or fellowship, but in itself an expression of Christian discipleship. In all our churches we have allowed the ministry to become affected by clericalism, and in consequence have allowed our vision of the laity to become infected by a kind of delegated clericalism. Perhaps we are just on the threshold of a whole new vision of what the worship and work of the world may become, both in relation to the order of Creation and to the order of Redemption. At times in both conferences there were traces of a pietism, which regards religion as an end in itself, and shrinks from contact with anything worldly; yet if we shrink from the world we shall never become instruments to lead the world to Christ.

Possibly, rather than shrink from the new world of technology and atomic power, we have got to discover a new Christian humanism which will dedicate this whole world to God, as an earlier Christian humanism sought to dedicate the learning of its day to God. It was encouraging that atomic power was regarded not only in timid terms as a means of destruction, but as something to be accepted and used in God's service.

The abiding impressions from each conference are gratitude for the most generous hospitality of the American Church and of many American friends; gratitude for a renewed and deepened fellowship in our own communion and in the World-wide Church; gratitude for new vision and hope in the living Christ, who reigns over his world, waiting that we through penitence and faith should claim the full promises offered to those who acknowledge his reign.

GEOFFREY ALLEN, BISHOP.

The Sacraments and the Fourth Gospel

VERY different views have been held on the extent of the sacramental interest of the Fourth Gospel. Rudolph Bultmann, for example, in his Meyer Commentary[1] excludes all references to the sacraments, even from those passages which are generally acknowledged to contain allusions to the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion. The reason for this is that Bultmann can find only one line of thought in the Fourth Gospel, that of revelation through the Word. On the other hand we have scholars like Oscar Culmann who find sacramental references in many narratives which are not always admitted by commentators who are sympathetic towards a more general sacramental interpretation of certain passages in the Fourth Gospel.[2]

We might ask how it is that competent scholars can arrive at such opposing conclusions. The answer lies in part at least to differing ideas on the unity of the Gospel and the purpose of its author. If the unity of the Gospel is denied, then it is easy to cut out those verses which appear to contradict what is believed to be the purpose of the Gospel. Bultmann, for example, regards the following passages as interpolations in order to maintain his thesis—3. 5; 6. 52b–58; 19. 34b–35.[3] Anything that seems to be out of harmony with his assertion that the Word of God is the revelation of God is regarded as being no part of the original Gospel. But this is at once too drastic and too simple. It seems to me to indicate a failure to understand the complex nature of the Fourth Gospel. There are many strands of thought in John, but they are woven together into one

[1] *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (1941).

[2] *Early Christian Worship* (S.C.M. Press), part of which appeared under the title *Les Sacrements dans l'Évangile Johannique* in 1951.

[3] See especially p. 360 of Bultmann's book. Cf. Carpenter, *The Johannine Writings*, p. 428.

whole. And I do not believe that anyone can interpret the Fourth Gospel correctly unless both the different levels of thought at which the author works and the unity of the whole are recognized. I believe that the Fourth Gospel contains a tradition of Christ's life and teaching every bit as reliable as that contained in the Synoptic Gospels.[1] Although occupied with the sublime discourses and glory-glimpses of the Word, the Evangelist does not lose sight of the lower elements of time and place on which its value as history depends. His dogmas are facts and his facts become dogmas. There is in fact a profound interlocking of history and symbolism. John's insistence that the Word was made flesh should make us hesitate before belittling the historical nature of this Gospel. But it is characteristic of John that while grasping the importance of the material fact he finds in it a deep spiritual significance. And this, after all, is the characteristic of all true history. A bare fact tells us nothing that is significant. It is history that is interpreted that is significant to us or to any one. In this Gospel we find that the non-historical factor penetrates the historical data, and that the historical factor is woven into what is clearly non-historical.[2] And this is the type of mind for whom the sacramental principle is most congenial. There is in John a keen recognition that after all man is not a pure spirit, and that to have full effect spiritual teaching must be combined with the visible and material. For this reason the Fourth Gospel with its insight into the spiritual significance of the material world has always been a source of inspiration to the Christian sociologist.

It is sometimes argued that John is too much of a mystic to be interested in the sacraments. But it should be noticed that some of the greatest mystics have also been devoted to the sacraments. Baron von Hügel has shown this clearly in his book *The Mystical Element in Religion*, and although he says that the aims and instincts of the Fourth Gospel are profoundly mystical, he agrees that the idea of the sacraments underlies the entire work.[3] It does not follow, therefore, that because there is a strong mystical strain in the thought of John this should prevent him from having also a profound sacramental interest.

Furthermore, I believe that the Fourth Gospel was written not for outsiders but for the members of the Christian Church. Dr C. H. Dodd, on the other hand, in his recent book *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* believes that its purpose was in the first place to commend Christian truth to thoughtful non-Christians in Asia Minor. We may indeed be grateful that the Christian Church had in those days a thinker who could present the Gospel in terms which could be appreciated by leaders of pagan thought. But I think it is doubtful if the primary purpose of the Gospel was to commend the faith to non-Christians. The polemical interests and apologetic motives of this Gospel have often been catalogued,[4] but it is just the

[1] See T. W. Manson's article in *John Rylands Bulletin*, May 1947.
[2] See my *The Religious Thought of St John*, pp. 27 ff. and 135 ff.
[3] Cf. *Ency. Brit.*, 11th edn, xv, 455.
[4] E.g. E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 65–144.

believers who need to have their faith stated in opposition to other positions. The kind of book which would have been written for outside propaganda is illustrated by the works of Justin Martyr and the other apologists. The Fourth Gospel breathes, I believe, the intimacy of the worshipping community.

The author, for example, throws out ideas quite without explanation, such as that the children of God are born not of flesh and blood, and the readers are not expected to find them strange. The author presupposes that a number of words which are the subject of misunderstanding on the part of some of the original hearers will be understood by the readers. They possess the key to the symbol used (cf. 2. 20; 3. 4; 4. 11; 7. 35; 11. 36). The introduction of the Beloved Disciple assumes that the first readers understand more than is clearly stated. It would be pointless for the author of chapter 21 to identify the Beloved Disciple as the author of the Gospel if the readers were outsiders and had no knowledge of either the Son of Zebedee or the Beloved Disciple.

It seems to me that if the Gospel was written for those who had no knowledge of the practice of Baptism or the conduct of the Eucharist we might well conclude that the author had no interest in giving any teaching about the sacraments. The references are so allusive that no pagan could possibly see any hint of the Christian sacraments in this Gospel. But in a Gospel written for those within the Church the cult-practices could be taken for granted and the emphasis laid through the subtle form of teaching in which the Evangelist delights. As the first readers of the Gospel were well acquainted with the sacramental practice and teaching of the Church, most of them would recognize the indirect allusions to Baptism and Holy Communion.[1] In fact they had probably heard sermons which illustrated the deep spiritual teaching of the sacraments by use of such miracles as we have in the Fourth Gospel. The most obvious example is that of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, but we know that the conversation with the Samaritan woman (4. 1–30), the healing of the crippled man at Bethesda (5. 1–19), and the healing of the blind man at the Pool of Siloam (9. 1–39), were chosen for the readings in the early Baptism liturgy.[2] It is not too much to believe that the first readers of the Gospel were aware of such interpretations and they would understand the significance by the way in which the stories were told. For example in chapter 9. verses 35–7, the form of question and answer would recall to mind the preliminary questions of the earliest baptismal ritual.

It is in fact the argument of Dr Cullmann that the purpose of the Fourth Gospel is to point to the full identity of our Lord, present in the early Christian congregation, with the historical Jesus. He traces a line from the Christ of history to Christ the Lord of the

[1] Allusions to the sacrament can be found in the following passages: 1. 6–8, 15, 19–34; 2. 1–11, 12–22; 3. 1–21, 22–36; 4. 1–30; 5. 1–19; 6. 1–13, 26–65; 9. 1–39; 13. 1–20, 34; 15. 1–7; 19. 34.

[2] See *The Fourth Gospel*, by E. C. Hoskyns (ed. Davey, 1947), pp. 351 and 363 ff.

Community. The presence of Christ among his people is normally realized in Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Evangelist seeks to show the relation between the risen Christ present in the Christian sacraments and the historical Jesus; one and the same Person is present in different forms.[1]

It is sometimes argued that the author of the Fourth Gospel deliberately minimized the importance of the sacraments by excluding any specific mention of their institution. But we cannot conclude that Baptism was unimportant for him because he omitted an account of the Baptism of Jesus. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel was not one who should come to human hands to receive baptism, any more than he could be tempted of the devil or suffer agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. There may also be a conscious desire on the part of John to minimize the influence of John the Baptist, whose followers were active for some time after our Lord's resurrection. We cannot, of course, build any conclusion on the statement that Jesus actually baptized during his early ministry,[2] a statement contradicted in the next chapter. These passages involve the insoluble problem of sources incompletely worked up into the Gospel.

Likewise the omission of the institution of the Eucharist does not indicate any belittling of the sacrament. Various explanations have been given for this. Dr William Temple argued that the omission is to guard against any isolation of God's activity in the world. The sacraments represent a focus for the divine activity which is present throughout the world, and it is this wider truth that John would have his readers learn.[3] This is no doubt very true, but there may have been another motive at work which is worth considering. The Eucharistic celebrations of the primitive Church were not of one type but of two.[4] There was a Jerusalem type which was not a commemoration of the Last Supper, but a common meal continuing their table-fellowship with the Lord and looking forward to reunion with him in the New Age. The Pauline type, on the other hand, stressed the commemoration of the action of our Lord on the night in which he was betrayed, as a memorial of the New Dispensation inaugurated by his death. It may be that the eucharistic teaching of the Fourth Gospel is divorced from the Last Supper because the author believed that the commemorative aspect was entirely missing. The Eucharist in his opinion was a present communion with the exalted Lord. John does not preserve simply the early Jerusalem type, for the eschatological hope has almost—not quite, but almost—disappeared from his picture. But it is the fact of present communion that he wishes to emphasize and for this reason, it is suggested, he does not record the Institution at the Last Supper lest it should be too closely associated with the commemorative aspect. This certainly

[1] *Early Christian Worship*, pp. 37 ff.

[2] Flemington in *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, pp. 30 f., argues that the tradition that Jesus baptized might well be trustworthy.

[3] *Readings in St John's Gospel*, p. xxi.

[4] See A. B. Macdonald, *Christian Worship in the Primitive Church*, pp. 123–54.

is in agreement with the general tenor of Johannine thought and may have helped to influence his action in disassociating the eucharistic teaching from the actual Institution. But it does not explain his similar attitude towards Baptism.

We may ask therefore if there is any general reason which would explain his veiled and indirect method of giving the teaching usually associated with these two sacraments. It is clear that his allusive teaching is not due to any antipathy to the sacramental principle. He was probably aware of the dangers of unethical sacramentalism, of a form of religion which tended to become mere superstition. This would not be strange in a community surrounded by the mystery-cults. And although it is impossible for us here to show how the allusions to the sacraments throughout the Gospel emphasize the interior spiritual truth of the outward sign, we can illustrate this point from an examination of verse 34, chapter 13: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another."

Most commentators find the newness of this commandment in that it was enjoined according to a new measure, "as I have loved you". But the whole trend of the narrative in which the saying occurs appears to require that ἐντολὴ καινή shall break new ground and not be simply a restatement of familiar teaching.

Consider the circumstances: After Judas had departed from the Upper Room, Jesus found himself at last alone in the company of his true disciples, whom he had gathered out of the world. In the constitution of this little company he sees his earthly work finished and his Father glorified (13. 31). This was the New Israel brought to birth by the creative power of God. As one family they had just partaken of the New Covenant meal. When, therefore, he gives to his disciples a commandment which shall distinguish them from all the world (13. 35), what can this mean but the New Law for the New Covenant? It is old because it had been foretold by Jeremiah and had been the intention of God from all eternity (Jer. 31. 33; 32. 40). It is new because now for the first time it could be written on the hearts of men who abide in Christ. It was due to the insight of the prophets that they foresaw a New Covenant which would be written not on tables of stone but upon the heart and vitally appropriated by the elect children. The ἐντολὴ καινή is thus the inner meaning of the καινὴ διαθήκη.[1] In contrast to the ritual use of blood by Moses in establishing the ancient covenant, the Mediator of the better covenant gives his own life to be appropriated by the elect in order that they may abide in him and be fruitful in good works. Jesus is not only the embodiment of the New Commandment; he is also the sacrifice which establishes the New Covenant. Through his sacrifice life is released so that it may be shared by the faithful. One of the means by which this life (the personality of Christ whose essential nature is love) is appropriated by the faithful is the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. But John in his characteristic

[1] Cf. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes*, p. 288.

manner emphasizes the spiritual side of the sacrament—the spirit of love without which the *opus operatum* is valueless.[1]

The important place which the sacraments occupy in the mind of John can be seen from the emphasis he places on the water and blood which flowed from the side of Christ (19. 34). Here we have the record of a physical phenomenon, but it made a great impression on the eye-witness who saw in the incident a profound spiritual meaning. In 1 John 5. 6 he says: "This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood." This passage may refer to either the life-giving and cleansing work of Christ or the two sacraments. It would be in harmony with John's method if both these interpretations were intended. The water symbolizes purification, and the blood life released in death. Both the perfect life and the sacrificial death of Jesus were necessary for the victory over sin. Not merely the purity of his life but also his death upon the cross are the sources of the victory over sin and the cause of rebirth: "not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood". To this the Spirit[2] perpetually bears witness in the experience of the converted. The Spirit, the water, and the blood bear witness to the perfect sacrifice of Jesus and to the benefits which are secured by it. They are the means by which eternal life is communicated to men, and of this communication Baptism (3. 5) and the Eucharist (6) are the effective symbols.

E. Kenneth Lee.

Demythologizing: The Problem of Validity[3]

In June of this year Theology published a paper by Mr J. S. Bezzant entitled *"De-Mythologizing" the Gospel.* In offering some further reflections upon the same subject—Rudolph Bultmann's *New Testament and Mythology*[4]—I must begin by saying that this is in no sense a critical "reply" to Mr Bezzant (with whom I am in substantial agreement), but a study which I hope may be seen as complementary to his.

It might seem as if the title I have chosen were either bombastic and empty, or claimed nothing less than the entire field of myth and the Bible as its theme. For does not *every* theologian aim at producing *valid* theology, and is not "the problem of validity" only another name for the theologian's problems as a whole? And yet it is all too easy in theology to muffle this question of validity, for all its importance, to veil and camouflage inadvertently the logical structure of what is being undertaken. Nothing is harder than for the theo-

[1] For a fuller exposition see my *The Religious Thought of St John,* pp. 244 ff., and the references given there.

[2] The way in which John associates the Holy Spirit with the sacraments is very striking, e.g. 3. 5 and 6. 63—perhaps the origin of the *epiklesis.*

[3] This article is a shortened version of a paper read at Easter 1954 to the Society for the Study of Theology, at Queens' College, Cambridge.

[4] Together with his other essays in *Kerygma and Myth* (S.P.C.K., 1953).

logian to write so transparently that the reader is kept aware of exactly what claims are essential to the validity of the doctrine or theory concerned, and what are subsidiary; carefully distinguishing the logical from the psychological, the historical from the metaphysical—at every stage. In his field clarification and verification constantly merge into one another. To see clearly what a theology demands is to begin seeing how plausible or implausible are those demands. Notoriously, the theologian's utterances about God put constant severe strain upon the vocabulary with which he is compelled to work: the lines of communication between the senses which he gives his words and ordinary use are ever on the point of being ruptured—a truth which he may learn from Kant as well as from Wittgenstein. It is therefore of paramount importance that he should show, as far as he can, what functions his language is performing—when literal, when symbolical, when descriptive, when evaluative.

In what follows, I want to ask how far the contributors to the debate on Demythologizing have been alert to this question of meaning and validity. How far, in particular, does Bultmann himself reveal an awareness of it? If my conclusions (like Mr Bezzant's) are unsympathetic, this must not be taken as evidence of a sceptical indifference to Bultmann's problems.

The pith of my criticism is this: that Bultmann's methods and terminology tend to insulate his claims against the possibility of verification or falsification (using these words in their widest sense); that this happens not in conjunction with a reasoned assertion that theological propositions are by nature unsettlable, but *by default* through ambiguities and confusions in crucial terms, which effectively prevent the question of validity being raised as it ought to be raised and even deny the language whereby this could be done.

My remarks may be grouped under five headings.

1. *The Definition of Myth.* Any instability in the concept of myth itself would imperil the discussion at point after point. Yet Bultmann neither offers a satisfactory definition nor abides by the definition he does offer. "Mythology", he writes (10),[1] "is the use of imagery to express the otherworldly in terms of this world and the divine in terms of human life, the other side in terms of this side." This definition is sufficiently wide in its scope to include all pictorial, analogical, and symbolical speech whatever. In another place Bultmann concedes that *all* utterance about God is analogical, and therefore (if the first definition is to stand) irreducibly mythological. Bultmann cannot mean this. For if it were true, it would make demythologizing a logically impossible task; and the contrast he constantly wishes to make between "mere mythology" and authentic existentialist interpretation would be robbed of its basis. Perplexity does not end here. In a discussion on the expression "act of God" (196 ff.) Bultmann decides against calling this "mythological language", on the ground that "mythological thought regards the divine activity . . . as an interference with the course of nature", and "acts of God", to Bult-

[1] All references are to pages in *Kerygma and Myth.*

mann, are not of this sort. Therefore to speak of such acts is not to speak mythologically, but *analogically*. This conclusion, however, violates his original definition of myth in two ways at once:

(*a*) Bultmann is saying: "the expression 'act of God' is not mythological but analogical", whereas on his definition this antithesis could not be made, since "myth" is there plainly the "genus" word, with "analogy", "pictorial image", etc., as species.

(*b*) The "mythological" has been redefined as that which depicts God as "interfering in the course of nature"; while the first definition concerned itself only with myth as a form of language, and said nothing at all about the *content* of any particular myths.

Here, then, in the definition of "myth", is an issue on which greater logical rigour is urgently required, if the discussion is to be set on a secure foundation.

2. *The Flight from the Evidential.* Bultmann's reluctance to face problems of validity manifests itself in a recurrent pattern of argumentation which could be schematized in roughly the following way:

(*a*) A fact or argument appears, which *prima facie* is hostile to the validity of the Christian position.
(*b*) Bultmann turns aside from its negative evidential implication, and
(c) transforms the hostile fact in such a way as to make it yield positive support for a modified and freshly secured theological view.

The suspicion grows, as one reads, that no evidence at all would be admitted as finally detrimental to Bultmann's position. If he actually believes this (and it is not an *absurd* belief to hold), it ought to be clearly exhibited as the crucial tenet it undoubtedly would be, and argued for as such.

Two simple examples may bring out this pattern of thought.

(1) On page 11 of *Kerygma and Myth* Bultmann describes how antinomies are generated by conflicting imagery in the New Testament. "The Virgin birth is inconsistent with the assertion of [Christ's] pre-existence", so is the Creation doctrine with talk about the "rulers of this world" and the law as God-given with the statement that it came from the angels. To Bultmann all this implies, "Rise, therefore, *above* the mythological."

(2) Christ failed to return in the way the disciples had at first expected. We ought, says Bultmann, to profit from their mistake; recognizing that the Last Things are mythological conceptions, not historical. In both cases a difficulty is metamorphosed into a theologically acceptable "truth". But in each case too Bultmann has side-stepped an equally important sceptical option—without giving adequate reason for so doing. In the first case we might say, "Conflicting views? then so much the worse for the reliability and consistency of the documents!" and in the second, "Jesus did not come, because the disciples were simply and tragically wrong about him." Plausibility can be given to such evasive moves in individual cases, but only so long as the by-passed sceptical options are never gathered

together and faced *cumulatively* as a challenge, more or less formidable, to the Christian position.

One may go further; the whole category of the evidential is repeatedly pushed aside by Bultmann as of no importance or, worse, as a snare. He speaks scornfully of the "provable". The language of myth is concrete and pictorial, concerned with stones rolling away and men rising into the sky, suggesting in many cases events that might be captured by the camera. Not so the truths of non-mythological Christian belief: for to Bultmann the removal of Christianity from the realm of myth upgrades it in value; so much so that the reader is prepared to accept, if he is off-guard, that to remove it from the realm of the "provable" must also be an act of upgrading, to be welcomed like a release from a long-standing bondage. But in this way Bultmann has again omitted to argue for a vital proposition, namely that absence of evidence does not disqualify a religion from being acceptable by reasonable men, or that "unprovable" here is not equivalent to "baseless" or "unfounded", as it undeniably is in many contexts.

The furthest Bultmann goes in this extraordinary and fascinating flight from the evidential is to transform the failure to obtain historical evidence into an aggressive refusal to accept any *possibility* of proof. Thus he rejects 1 Cor. 15. 3–8 as evidence for the resurrection, not explicitly on critical grounds, but in his own words—"that line of argument is fatal *because* it tries to adduce a proof for the kerygma" (112, my italics).

An avowed historical agnosticism about the events of Jesus' life would be quite unexceptionable. What one finds in Bultmann, however, is something much more positive and dogmatic. At many crucial points he casts about in his mind for an interpretation of an event which he thinks adequate to the existential seriousness of Christianity and proceeds to *read back* his interpretation into the original documents, however these may resist the treatment, and however many critical questions may be begged. It is one thing to say "I have no idea what happened at the Ascension, but it provides an excellent symbol for Christ's oneness with the Father": quite another to say "The Ascension did not happen—*could* not have happened: it is an excellent symbol", etc. To speak of the "unique and final revelation of God in history" may be misleading as Bultmann claims, in its tendency to lead to thinking of that revelation as a *revelatum*, "something which took place in the past and is now an object of detached observation" (111). But anxiety on this score has gone too far when it results in a fight against history itself, and it cannot be invoked as justification for shunning the evidential.

(3) *Fact and Language.* A theology which aims at being logically transparent must carefully distinguish issues of fact from matters of linguistic convenience. Now, the very word "demythologize" strongly suggests a venture in translation, the substitution of more literal language for pictorial and symbolic language. Yet this is thoroughly deceptive. If the Ascension, say, is amenable to demythologizing, that is to say something not only about the language in which the "event"

is described, but to decide also about the actual status of the event itself, to deny that Jesus did in fact rise into the air. And no linguistic investigation could lead by itself to such conclusions. Put it differently; to qualify for myth-hood, a statement must be (on Bultmann's definition) actually about "the other world" or "the other side". The process of demythologizing must accordingly consist of at least two phases, of which the first is the recognition that the Scriptural account is mythological in nature, while the second phase reinterprets its substance non-mythologically. But the question whether any particular narration *is* mythological cannot be settled by Bultmann or any one else while acting in the capacity of *translator*. An event such as a piece of prophetic symbolism may be historical (Jesus did enter Jerusalem in triumph) and at the same time be mythological in Bultmann's sense. Or the alleged event may not have happened and the narrative still retain mythological value. What one must insist is that whether or not the imagery, etc., of the narrative yields itself to translation into existentialist terms, this does nothing to tell us which of those possibilities is more likely to be true. Yet Bultmann repeatedly suggests that "X is described in mythological terms" implies "X cannot have happened as narrated", and does not make it plain that the latter judgment requires a quite distinct investigation.

Space permits only one example of this sort of confusion. "Take . . . the case of a child being sacrificed in order to insure the success of an enterprise or to avert misfortune. Such a practice implies a crude mythological conception of God" (108). Here the rejection of a primitive view of sacrifice appears to be part and parcel with Bultmann's general impatience with the mythological: its repudiation is represented as involved in the passage from myth to non-myth. But is not this misleading in the extreme? What is "crude" about the sacrifice theory is not its mythological nature but its *moral* inadequacy. Abandoning it is not a piece of linguistic spring-cleaning but a value-judgment, logically quite different.

4. *Myth and Oblique Language.* The project of demythologizing raises in an acute form the general problem of the religious use of language, the logical nature of statements about God. We may start with Bultmann's crucial sentences—"there are certain concepts which are fundamentally mythological and with which we shall never be able to dispense—e.g. the idea of transcendence. In such cases, however, the original mythological meaning has been lost, and they have become mere metaphors or ciphers" (102 f.). "Mere metaphors" suggests "as near literal as makes no difference". But in fact it makes a great deal of difference. The gulf between literal or direct and oblique language cannot be bridged so lightheartedly. For if propositions about God are irreducibly oblique—that is, symbolical, analogical, and so on, then to demythologize is not to remove all obliqueness, but only obliqueness of certain sorts: if, on the other hand, it is possible to speak literally of God, then demythologizing is quite a different activity, not one of translation out of one code into another, but rather of *de*-coding altogether. The question which

should be of greatest concern to the theologian is not whether this or that myth can be re-expressed in language less flagrantly pictorial, more abstract in appearance, but whether or not the circle of myth, metaphor, and symbol, is a closed one; and if closed then in what way propositions about God manage to *refer*. Bultmann's first definition of "myth" gave the word a sense sufficiently extended to include every kind of oblique language; yet in practice he gives very little scrutiny indeed to this general question, and even (as we noticed) contrasts the mythological with the analogical—a procedure for which his definition gives no warrant. The nature of demythologizing as an enterprise must remain logically obscured so long as we leave unsettled that vital question "Is any direct talk about God possible, or can one talk only obliquely of him?"

Bultmann's critics have often pointed out that his existentialist terminology is no less mythological than the New Testament ideas from which he wishes to deliver us. Bultmann, we noticed, is prepared to admit this: even "transcendence" is a mythological concept, but one (he is assured) in which myth is merely vestigial, neutralized, reduced to the harmless status of "mere metaphor or cipher". But the more searching objection can still be made that this appearance of directness and abstract sterility can be (logically) a menace. If the demythologized talk of God is still oblique, then it should display its obliqueness overtly; for to carry it surreptitiously may be rather like treating measles by hiding the rash with face-powder. For all we know, the suppressed picture, the latent myth, may still be doing the work in the expression concerned, and the "cashing" of it may be impossible without once more reverting to the concealed, but active, myth.

5. *The Existentialist Interpretation.* So far I have been trying to lay bare some of the pitfalls which beset Bultmann's enterprise, ways in which the problem of validity tends to be side-stepped in demythologizing, and the logic of theological statements obscured rather than clarified. Something must be said in conclusion, however briefly, about the other half of the total program—the revision of the Christian message in existentialist terms. Do existentialist modes of thought, as Bultmann adopts them, help or hinder the fashioning of a theology whose logical structure reveals itself through its presentation and terminology?

In the first place, there is an undeniable advance from a sentimentalist analysis of belief (as in Schleiermacher) to an existentialist analysis. The advance is comparable to that recent progress from the positivist's dichotomy between "descriptive" and "emotive" language to the recognition of the variety of actual linguistic functions, as seen in the writings of philosophers like Wisdom and Austin. Existentialism provides the theologian (the poet and the novelist too) with a rich vocabulary in which to express important elements of the human situation—dereliction, anguish, decision, commitment, and many more. Indeed its theological adaptability is not matter for surprise, since the roots of existentialism go back as far as Pascal and Augustine.

But the adoption of a twentieth-century existentialist terminology is not without its dangers. Certain of these were admirably discussed in Christopher Evans's broadcast review of *Kerygma and Myth*, and others were cogently presented in Mr Bezzant's article. The two points which follow are no more than footnotes to those.

A potential source of trouble is the unlimited hospitality which existentialist thought gives to the paradoxical. Even granting that there are situations in which one is forced to say "This is a paradox, an enigma, a mystery", there are others in which the proper response is "This is paradoxical, contradictory, and nonsensical." The more cautious a theologian is of paradoxical language—the less he revels in it for its own dramatic sake—the less likely he will be to revere the nonsensical and the invalid when he ought to be dismissing them. His ideal language is one which (by its reluctance to resort to paradox in all but unavoidable contexts) reduces the risk of such confusions as far as possible. Again, it is not an insensitivity to the value of metaphor and analogy in exposition that prompts the suspicion that existentialist language is frequently over-tolerant also of these. In sentences like "we possess the present through encounter" (116) the adoption of the language of drama in the field of general philosophy has begotten a metaphorical mode of speech in which cogent argumentation or criticism is desperately hard. Distortion is inevitable when all relations come to be conceived on the model of inter-personal encounter.

Secondly, an existentialist dramatic vocabulary tends on occasion illicitly to prescribe to the theologian what questions he should or should not pursue, where his inquiry should start and (worse still) where it should end. Bultmann writes: "It is not for us to question the credentials [of the word of preaching]. It is we who are questioned . . ." (41). Perhaps: but this alluring language of drama cannot justify the theologian's evasion of that abiding and ultimate question—"*on what grounds* ought I to assume an attitude of obedience before the New Testament and not before, say, the Koran?" On another page we read: "The right question to frame with regard to the Bible . . . is the question of human existence" (192), as if by the weightiness of existentialist utterance itself one could smother the thousand-and-one *other* questions—of historicity, integrity of text, interpretation—which likewise clamour for their answer. Here existentialism has become Bultmann's master, not his servant. So long as it provides the means of expressing what without its terms would be inexpressible, theologians can do nothing but respect it: but it is time to protest when it proceeds arbitrarily to impose limits upon critical examination, whether of doctrine or document.

The quest for a language that is adequate to describe our experience in all its multifariousness is the common task of philosophers and theologians. They must resist equally the artificial truncation of language on dogmatic positivist lines, and any language ("inflationary" language, Isaiah Berlin would call it) which is given to the multiplication of metaphysical or theological entities beyond necessity and cries mystery where there is not always mystery but some-

times only muddle. In each case a defective linguistic instrument is an obstacle not only to clarity in exposition but also to the attainment of validity.

RONALD W. HEPBURN.

Transatlantic Liturgy

WHEN the present American Prayer Book was adopted in 1928, the Revision Commission was continued in being in order to see the book through the press and to deal with further suggestions for revision which might be made in the future. By the year 1949 the quantity of suggestions in the files was such that the General Convention authorized the Liturgical Commission to publish a series of *Prayer Book Studies*,[1] in which these suggestions and the observations of the Commissioners upon them might be made known. This seems an altogether better method of arriving at proposals which will reflect the mind of the Church than to submit new draft revisions to the General Convention with all the resulting debate that this involved between 1913 and 1928.

I. *Baptism and Confirmation.* It might be expected from the amount of controversy in England over "Christian Initiation" that this would be one of the longest of the *Studies*. In fact, however, controversial matters are largely by-passed and the whole *Study* only occupies 35 pages, including the text of the rites.

The Commissioners' work in this case is, on the whole, excellent. They have abbreviated with a view to encouraging Baptism at public services according to the rubric, and to clarifying the structure of the services. They have succeeded in doing this without involving themselves in lengthy theological debate or departing (as our 1928 rite did) from the doctrinal standards of 1662. Like those whose work is enshrined in the *Rituale Romanum*, they understand that it is not necessary to lecture the congregation upon the doctrine of original sin and that it is not possible to do so in terms which are at once concise, intelligible and orthodox. The "interpretation" of the Gospel (which is so much harder to follow than St Mark), the prayer following, the Mozarabic prayers after the promises, and the final address to the sponsors, are all omitted. None of these need be regretted except (at least in English circumstances) the last; there are many unnecessary exhortations in the Prayer Book, but this is not one of them.

There are, however, some detailed changes (or failures to change) which seem to call for reconsideration. It is permitted to omit a lesson and canticle at Morning or Evening Prayer if there is to be a Baptism; this is to destroy the Office and is surely unnecessary when the baptismal rite has been so severely pruned. For the Gospel, Mark 10 is retained, with its suggestion to the ill-instructed that

[1] *Prayer Book Studies* I–V by the Standing Liturgical Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., Church Pension Fund, Church Hymnal Corporation, New York. $3.60.

unless you are baptized in infancy you cannot be baptized at all; why not return to the Matthaean parallel (Sarum), which has not the "exception"? In the promises, the Creed is reduced to a simple form, for which (since an adult candidate will have been instructed in the Apostles' Creed in the Catechism) there is much to be said; but it is a pity that the third phrase does not read: "And in the Holy Ghost *in the Holy Church*" (Hippolytus). This seems to be desirable both on doctrinal and on literary grounds.

The rite of Confirmation is dealt with in an equally straightforward manner. After some discussion chrismation is not revived officially, though it is admitted that many American bishops practise it. Some existing American improvements on 1662 are retained, such as the omission of the "Preface", which in certain circumstances made nonsense; the formal presentation of the candidates (now made even more like that at an Ordination); and the greater solemnity surrounding the great prayer for the Spirit. New improvements include a renewal of vows more closely related to the vows at the Baptism service (but why no renunciation of the devil?), and the alteration of the word "defend" to "confirm" in the prayer at the imposition. This proposal will arouse misgivings in some quarters; but at least it helps to make plain that the rite *is* Confirmation. The 1662 Order uses the verb "confirm" only twice—in neither case in a sense comparable with the title "Confirmation". An addition which seems to be less desirable is an introductory Office; but this is optional and does not mar the value of a pair of rites which succeed in removing most of the difficulties of 1662 without raising fresh problems.

II. *The Liturgical Lectionary*. It is surprising that the Eucharistic Lectionaries should have occupied so early a place in this series of *Studies*, for they depend upon the Calendar; and it is hard to believe that the Commissioners will have nothing to say upon that subject. Indeed, a number of Calendar problems, such as the need for a second Sunday after Christmas and the chronological inexactitude of the commemoration of the Innocents and the Purification, are considered piecemeal in this work. They are on the whole dealt with reasonably; but it is unfortunate that the interpretations of the Calendar common in the pulpit seem to be accepted uncritically by the Commissioners. The most notable instance of this is the belief that the "Trinity" season is devoted to the carrying of "the moral implications of the Faith into the living of the Christian life". I do not question the propriety of this use of these Sundays for teaching purposes; but the existing liturgical scriptures and Collects do not lend it support. If the Commissioners wish this interpretation to be part of the Liturgy, and not simply a didactic convention, they will have to begin by writing a fresh series of Collects.

The firm proposals of the Commissioners, however, are not many in number and are moderate in character; and it is to be hoped that the reasons given for them will be widely studied. Most of them are simply an attempt to tidy up the confusion left by the haphazard growth of the lectionaries. But some of them are of importance to

the life of the Church. It is therefore good to find that the Commissioners are in this matter prepared to take their stand upon principles even when faced with popular demand for their abandonment. A good example of this is their discussion of the use of the Passion narratives in Holy Week, where the demand for a Gospel about the Triumphal Entry as an alternative for Palm Sunday is met with permission to use this at the former of two celebrations of Holy Communion as long as the whole of the Matthew Passion is read at the second service.

III. *Ministration to the Sick.* This *Study* is a 39-page pamphlet consisting of an account of the defects of the existing order for the Visitation of the Sick and a series of seven new orders to be used at a series of visits. Each is prefaced by a confession, general or "particular"; and all are short forms with antiphon, psalm, lesson, versicle, and collect. The Ministration concludes with a litany and a set of prayers for the sick and those who minister to them, together with forms for the blessing of oil and the laying on of hands with or without unction. The whole Ministration is characterized by an excellent simplicity. There is no sentimentality; and the priest does not appear as a thaumaturge. So this Order, while it will not meet with universal approval, may be commended as one of the more healthy among the many of its kind. The ministry to the dying, however, is not dealt with at all.

IV. *The Eucharistic Liturgy.* The fourth and largest of the *Studies* (343 pp.) is devoted to the Eucharist; and it is a very disappointing book. We are led to expect that its proposals will mark a real advance upon others of their kind; but, in spite of a lengthy essay in justification, it is very much "the mixture as before". The proposals amount only to a rather timid reshuffling of the material (after a certain amount of dusting with concomitant disaster to the ornaments) in accordance with rather stale ideas which have been circulating in the Anglican Communion with too little opposition for too long. Once again, the vital theological and structural questions are untouched; so it is not to be wondered at if people are bored to death with Prayer Book revision and are apt to prefer the existing books to be left alone lest a worse befall.

The historical introduction is justified by the statement that the ancient liturgies offer most necessary standards of reference by which to judge the Liturgy and proposals for its revision. But the Commissioners are not in fact guided by these standards in the greater matters which they have to consider; and they overlook the fact that there is an overruling standard in the New Testament. The result of this is that their consideration of the *anaphora* is still concerned with the developed Eastern and Western theories of consecration; and the *anaphora* of their Liturgy, while it contains traces of the idea of consecration by the dominical words, takes the invocation of the Holy Spirit as its highlight. While the American *anaphora* has for some time been more eucharistic than 1662, there is still no real awakening to the fact that the N.T. teaches us that the Lord *gave thanks*, so that the act of thanksgiving itself has a very strong claim

to be the essential aspect of the Eucharistic Prayer. Both the *epiclesis* and the traditional way of using the institution are late growths, neither of them deriving any support from Scripture. Again, while the Fraction is restored to its ancient place, the Offertory is still separated from the *anaphora* by the Prayer for the Church and the Communion Devotions. Any intention to clarify the structure of the rite, so well in evidence in the treatment of Baptism and Confirmation, seems to be strangely lacking in the proposals for the Eucharist.

Other instances of the unsatisfactory nature of the Commissioners' methods in dealing with the Eucharist could be given; I would particularly draw attention to their treatment of the Intercession and the Communion Devotions. It is therefore to be hoped that the Church will beware of their proposals and will demand that any future revision be based upon a closer following of the New Testament than in the past and upon an attachment to history equal to that professed by the Commissioners in their introduction and greater than that which is displayed in their proposals.

V. *The Litany.* Here the Commissioners give an interesting, if necessarily compressed, survey of the history and use of litanies in the Church, together with a revision of the Prayer Book Litany and a shorter form which they call the "Litany of S. Chrysostom" and claim to be a reconstruction of the Byzantine Litany of about A.D. 400. The revision amounts to a tidying up and modernization of Cranmer, with the Supplication made optional and independent. In general, this is a useful piece of work, though details will be less pleasing to some ears than to others. It is, however, odd to find the President of the U.S. included among the petitions for the *Church*, of which he is not required to be a member. The Commissioners' answer to this query (p. 33) is that this is a prayer for the peace of the Church; but is that the only reason for praying for rulers? It would seem more natural to make this petition a prayer for peace through rulers in general and to pray for a particular ruler among the petitions for the *world*.

The "Litany of S. Chrysostom" is said to be based on the enarxis litany of the Byzantine rite plus the Liturgy of St. James, the Stowe Missal, the Ambrosian Missal of Pamelius and a document from Fulda printed by Warren. This is a curious collection of authorities. Stowe is a Latin version of an extant Greek litany which is by language, age, and origin (Rome), a prior authority to Stowe. Warren's text is derived from a lost book which must have been of comparable authority with Stowe. And since all the additional material except the invitation at the beginning can be found in the Apostolic Constitutions or St James, this seems an unnecessarily cumbrous work of collation. But the resulting litany is a convenient and useful form, although Mr President again appears in the unaccustomed role of a Byzantine *Basileus*.

Studies I, III, and V, are recommended for general reading. Numbers II and IV should be attempted only by seasoned addicts of Prayer Book revision literature.

BERNARD WIGAN.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Right Rev. Geoffrey Allen is Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

The Rev. E. Kenneth Lee is Vicar of Horsforth, Leeds.

Mr Hepburn is Assistant Lecturer in Moral Philosophy at King's College, Aberdeen.

The Rev. B. J. Wigan is Vicar of East Malling, Kent.

CORRESPONDENCE

MISSIONARY METHODS IN AN ENGLISH PARISH

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I am grateful to Mr Howdill and Mr Cuff, the joint proposers of the Resolution they mention, for the moderation of their letter. My article was written and submitted in November 1953, and although the Editor sent me the proofs in June of this year, it did not seem to me that the meeting mentioned was more than one further manifestation of the opposition of which I had already included many instances. Indeed, the significant thing to my mind was that whilst the parish was being canvassed for this meeting of protest, the Hon. Treasurer announced that promises to the Church Maintenance Fund had lately risen by over £100, and during the first nineteen weeks of this year, which included 12 January, the date of the "protest meeting", the other collections in Church had risen by £50, compared with the same period of the previous year. It would appear that many regular worshippers simply did not wish to attend a meeting whose purpose was evident from the motion to be put forward.

It is also quite true that 13 of the 30 members of the P.C.C. subscribed to the calling of the meeting, and no doubt voted for the motion. These 13 P.C.C. members very properly did not stand for re-election this year, as they could not conscientiously support their parish priest.

Mr Carpenter's letter calls for comment.

1. He criticizes the equation of "the marks of the Lord Jesus" with the Duties of Church Membership as set out in the "Short Guide". Yet he gives no alternative suggestion of what these marks should be. If he can find a "mark of the Lord Jesus" which is not included in the Guide now given to us, I shall be very much surprised!

In parenthesis, he objects to two pages being given to the duty of Christian Stewardship, as if this suggests that it is more important than other Christian duties. Surely he realizes that it needs more explanation simply because it has been more neglected than the rest. A physician deals with a patient at the point where he is sick, whether it is a vital part of his anatomy or not. Christian people to-day are not, I would suggest, weak in prayer, or worship, or even

witness. But they are weak in Stewardship! So more attention must be given to this particular, and neglected, duty. And because witnessing to Stewardship is dangerous, must we not attempt it?

The suggestion that a man is a Christian because he fulfils certain duties simply does not find a place in my article, and Mr Carpenter is mistaken in thinking so. These things do not make a Christian. But no Christian should find any difficulty in willingly and happily doing them. It is precisely because this willingness and happiness to do Christian things is absent from so many who come to the Church for God's blessing, that a parish priest must surely diagnose a spiritual malady, and give the spiritually sick one not what he wants, but what God wants him to have.

3. I do not think your readers will find the cause for alarm which Mr Carpenter is attempting to create. If there is really something "sinister" in expecting the Church of God to make a "concerted effort" to change bad ways, then I believe we are called to be sinister!

6. Here we are really at issue! Mr Carpenter says, "the Establishment itself is a delicate compromise between freedom and authority, and can be made to work only with tolerance and good will". Is this the note of the first Apostles? It is certainly not a missionary-hearted word. If indeed the Establishment is sacred, beyond the voice of conscience, and the unimpeded response of a fearless Church to the call of her Lord, then Mr Carpenter is right, and I am wrong.

Yours faithfully,

J. C. WANSEY.

THE RECTORY,
WOODFORD,
LONDON, E.18.

THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The Rev. Harold Riley's contention that articles purporting to give information about the Church of South India must of necessity be biased, if they are written by members of that body, may or may not be true. What seems quite irrefutable is that one can get accurate information about C.S.I., as distinct from hearsay, only from that source. After all, if one wants information about the Church of Rome, one does not expect a Methodist or a Baptist to supply it, one turns to a devout and intelligent Roman Catholic, and the same principle seems to hold good in this case.

I should like to add that Mr Riley's reminder that the C.S.I. is "in a transitional state" is a wise one. To my mind this fact makes it more, and not less, important that the Church of England should "make up its mind in 1955 about whether it ought or ought not to be in full communion with the Church of South India", for it means that the course of action which she adopts now must help to form the final pattern which C.S.I. eventually takes on. For this reason the continuation of a "wait and see" policy on the part of the Church

of England would be an act not of prudent common sense, but of unpardonable irresponsibility.

St Francis Vicarage,
Ashton Gate,
Bristol 3.

A. K. Hamilton.

THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

While it is rarely possible to show that the historic practice of the Church is logically and necessarily *entailed* by the foundation truths of the Christian Faith, it is frequently possible to show that it is organically *coherent* with them and that there is a close correspondence between its details and theirs. Such, I suggest, is the case with regard to the restriction of the ordained priesthood to the male sex. That human nature as such, and not merely male human nature, has been redeemed and renewed by the Incarnation of God the Word is undeniable, and it is presumably the basis for the priestly character which is enjoyed by the whole Church as the Body of Christ. There is, however, the further fact to be taken into account that the Word (as is congruous with his personal name, as the Son [not the daughter] of the Father) became man as a male individual, and in that male humanity he performs for ever that priestly work of which the work of the ordained priest in the Church is a communication and a participation. It would seem to be this fact, and not any "inferiority" of women under the New Dispensation (an inferiority which is in any case a highly qualified one, in view of Ephesians 5. 25 f.), which is the basis of the masculinity of the historic priesthood. The fact must be faced that, in the mystery of the Incarnation, the two sexes are involved in different ways. It was *male human nature* that the Son of God united to his divine Person; it was a *female human person* who was chosen to be his Mother. On the other hand, no *male human person* was chosen to be the Son of God (to suppose that was the error of the adoptionists); and no *female human nature* was united to a divine Person. Thus from one point of view the Incarnation exalts the male sex above the female, in another sense it exalts the female above the male. In no woman has *human nature* been raised to the dignity which it possesses in the male human nature of Jesus of Nazareth, but to no other *human person* than Mary has there been given a dignity comparable to that of being the Mother of God. The fundamental fact about the two sexes is not that one is superior to the other, but that they are different. That difference is reflected both in the different roles that they play in the work of redemption and in the different roles that they play in the economy of the Church. It is, I believe, the almost complete neglect of Mariology in the Church of England that has led to the demand that the functions of the two sexes in the Church shall be simply identical.

There are other arguments against the priesthood of women, such

as the extremely powerful arguments of N. P. Williams which appear in one of the Appendices to his recent *Life* by Canon Kemp, but I would suggest that the fundamental point is to be found in the character of the Incarnation itself.

CHRIST CHURCH,
OXFORD.

Yours faithfully,
E. L. MASCALL.

BOOK REVIEWS

EARLY CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATIONS OF HISTORY. The Bampton Lectures of 1952. By R. L. P. Milburn. A. and C. Black. 18s.

LEADERS OF EARLY CHRISTIAN THOUGHT. By S. H. Mellone. Lindsey Press. 15s.

In his first chapter (p. 4) Mr Milburn defines his aim: "to consider what Christian writers from the second to the fifth century thought about the method and stuff of history, in the attempt to discover whether their approach to such matters was in fact vitiated by a casual heedlessness or by doctrinal interests, and in the hope that their achievement may throw some light on the historian's task, its risks and opportunities". As a background to his study he gives the opinions of many writers ranging from early times to the present day on the purpose and methods of the historian. He outlines the use and understanding of history by writers in the second century, and passes on to Origen, Eusebius, Augustine, Orosius and Salvian. He examines the treatment of historical themes in early Christian art and in the "Apocryphal New Testament", and leads on to a consideration of the historical basis for the doctrine of the bodily assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. He ends with a discussion of the work of Eusebius' continuers and the relationship of symbolism to fact.

The most fruitful approach to this book is that summed up in a quotation which Mr Milburn (p. 77) gives from Goethe:

> Wer den Dichter will verstehen
> Muss in Dichters Lande gehen.

His work is obviously based on wide reading and deep scholarship, but (to change the metaphor) his purpose is to paint a general picture with bold strokes and deft touches. The result is a real work of art. There is also a good deal of material for those who look to Bampton Lectures for something new in the way of scholarship or approach. The pages on Eusebius are particularly good. The chapter on early Christian art is an excellent illustration of the importance of non-literary texts for the historian, and their use in the hands of a master. (Dura is not, however, on the Orontes as stated on p. 99.) Throughout the book Mr Milburn makes many a contribution to the study of the theory of history-writing in general. In particular he stresses that the historian, in all his artistry and craftsmanship, must none the less remain in close touch with "brute fact". He shows how the main stream of early Christian writers, though they had no

theory of historical writing, by sure instinct remained true to what is required of the historian. Hereby he makes a tacit appeal to those Christians, who seem to be cutting adrift from history, to think over what they are doing.

It would have been of interest to have heard something about the "Antiochene" view, and St Athanasius' use of history. Nothing is said of Prudentius' *contra Symmachum* with its important philosophy of history. The synoptic outlook of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret is mentioned, but nothing is said of Rufinus' two books written in extension of Eusebius' *H.E.*, from which (or the work of Gelasius of Caesarea which may underlie them) the three historians may have learnt their approach. But, of course, a work of this scope is bound to have omissions.

In the second book under review Dr Mellone describes the nature and development of the main Christian doctrines down to the fifth century. His book is learned and fair-minded It abounds in summaries and quotations, and is especially good on the philosophical elements in the thought of the Fathers. Once again the footnotes are relegated to the end, and there is no proper bibliography. Some of the dates vary from those normally accepted, and now and then there are slightly misleading presentations of fact.

The purpose of this book seems to be to bring the Fathers to a circle of readers who might not otherwise read about them. If it succeeds in this, and causes the faith of the Fathers to be known and loved, it is indeed to be commended.

University of Nottingham. N. Q. King.

Le problème synoptique. By L. Vaganay. Desclée et Cie, Tournai. 200 Belgian francs.

Professor Vaganay is widely known for his introduction to the study of the textual criticism of the New Testament. Here, working on the scaffolding of the Biblical Commission's pronouncements on the relations between the Synoptic Gospels, he has done well to remind us that it is too easy a solution to build merely upon a two-document theory of Mark and Q behind Matthew and Luke or even upon the four-document theory of Streeter.

He postulates an oral tradition (O), it may be in Aramaic or in Greek, without endorsing the Form-critics' views that the Gospels were moulded by the Church during the period of the oral transmission of the Gospel. Below this O there lie, he maintains, various evangelistic essays (E), again partly in Aramaic, partly in Greek; he retains the papal belief in the priority of Matthew in some form, by deriving an Aramaic Gospel of Matthew (M) from O and E; from M it was a short step to the Greek form of Matthew, though not as we have it (Mg). A second Synoptic source appeared first in Aramaic (S), then in Greek (Sg); it was derived from E. Mark's Gospel descended from E, from oral tradition including especially the "Roman catechesis" of Peter, and also from Mg. Matthew's Gospel, as we

know it, is derived from Mark as well as from Sg, as well, of course, as being the product of O by way of Mg, M, and E; a line can also be drawn from it back to Sg allowing for a junction between the two. Luke, again, descends from O and E and goes back to these through Sg and S partly by way of M and partly through Mg; a line also is drawn tracing it back to Mark. The diagram on p. 444 makes this "working hypothesis" clear, as a bare summary cannot do.

Many non-Roman Catholic scholars will view these lines of Synoptic descent with the scepticism of one astronomer for another who traces canals on Mars. They may think that there is needless complication here and that the complication is due in part to the desire at all costs to maintain in some way the priority of Matthew before Mark. They may, however, note with satisfaction that a second Synoptic source is allowed (S or Sg), albeit different from Q, and that those who postulate the dependence of Luke on Matthew (and so eliminate Q) may be interested to read the arguments here for Luke's dependence rather on Mg and Sg.

This is a learned work with a good though concise bibliography. The author is well acquainted with English as well as Continental works on the subject; his brief account of the history of the Synoptic problem is excellent and there is a good index of Synoptic quotations at the end. Professor Vaganay handles a difficult subject with typical French lucidity and though, as he admits, there is nothing here that is strikingly original, his work opens up some interesting vistas, as he claims. Certainly by working along these lines, due allowance can be made for the influence of oral tradition on the Evangelists. Again, he has reconciled, so far as possible, the external testimony with the internal. Yet, though the Synoptic problem seems to be once more in the melting-pot, this work does not carry the conviction that the theory of Mark's priority is a delusion of Protestants. The book, however, will be valuable to anyone who is willing to work through it with a Synopsis open before him.

Merton College, Oxford. C. S. C. Williams.

The Kingdom of God. By John Bright. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. $3.75.

This is popularization at its finest. It is much to be hoped that an English publisher will adopt it. "There runs through the Bible," Dr Bright writes, "a unifying theme which is not artificially imposed. It is a theme of redemption, of salvation; and it is caught up particularly in those concepts which revolve about the idea of a people of God, called to live under his rule, and the concomitant hope of the coming Kingdom of God. This is a note which is present in Israel's faith from earliest times onward, and which is to be found, in one way or another, in virtually every part of the Old Testament. It also unbreakably links Old Testament to New. For both have to do with the Kingdom of God, and the same God speaks in both."

There is nothing new about that. But I know of no book that

traces the theme so lucidly through the Old Testament. We have been told so often that the Old Testament is not so much a book as a volume of books, been given so many aids to the dissection of it into strands within the books, been urged so frequently to reshuffle the Biblical order in deference to dates assigned by scholars to the strands, that we have been blinded to the underlying unity of the whole. Dr Bright has given us a book that will bring enlightenment and relief to any reader of the Bible.

Tracing the theme of the Kingdom of God through the Old Testament, he restores to that book its significance. His survey is brief but quite masterly. There are points about which one may disagree, but they do not affect his main theme. There are many more points which he illuminates. His chapter on the changes brought about by the inauguration of the monarchy by David is particularly valuable, making clear the dangers inherent in the stability that the monarchy brought. "Would Israel mistake the Davidic state for God's, and imagine that in it God *had* established his Kingdom?" And with that he goes on to the next chapter, entitled "A Kingdom under Judgment". At the end of each chapter, in a couple of paragraphs, he lightly and deftly suggests lessons that contemporary America may learn.

There are footnotes which give sufficient indication of contrary views on controversial matters. They are not obtrusive. I liked one charmingly honest personal confession, "I am unable to keep my mind made up on this subject."

The chapters on the New Testament might be called more sketchy, precisely because so much more has been written about the Kingdom of God in the New Testament. But for the general reader, whom Dr Bright has in mind, there is provided exactly what he wants. Most emphatic is the insistence that the Kingdom of God is not something that we can usher in and that "The New Testament church was confident that the victory over the dark powers of the old aeon had been won in Christ, so much so that the Kingdom of God could be spoken of as a present thing. Yet it was all too painfully aware that the Kingdom remained an unconsummated thing of the future which had yet to come in its power. In tension between the two the New Testament church lived and waited."

In a final chapter Dr Bright outlines current evasions of this tension and preaches what it involved in being, what the modern church still must be, the New Testament Church. I pick out one quotation here: "Then it is that having set up our organizations to nurture a race of Christian people, we find ourselves racing madly to get people to nurture the organizations."

This is Biblical Theology popularized and still retaining its integrity as Biblical Theology. Dr Bright wins with this book a $7,500 Abingdon-Cokesbury Prize. I congratulate not only Dr Bright but also the Abingdon-Cokesbury Press for their wisdom in awarding it to him.

The Deanery,
George, S.A.

F. C. Synge.

COMMUNION WITH GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By A. Raymond George. Epworth Press. 25s.

Mr George has given us a valuable addition to the growing number of volumes in which the main Biblical words and themes are re-examined, and their significance for Christian thought elucidated. This is a good example of post-critical Biblical scholarship; and preachers, theological teachers, and students, will be glad to have this work by them.

The particular question to which Mr George addresses himself is: how can we best describe the relation of the believer to God? He is not concerned primarily with the act of justification, but with the Christian man's growing awareness of God in this life, and with the nature of his relation to God in the life to come. What is the distinctive mark of Christian piety? What word is best used to describe our relation to God? Briefly his answer is: the word "communion". It is a relational word. As such it more fully expresses the Biblical description than, on the one hand, "union", "absorption" and the traditional language of mysticism; or, on the other hand, an exclusive use of soteriological terms, as in certain types of Protestantism. "The mystic supposes that that (I-Thou) relationship has been transcended." "Some anti-perfectionist Protestants stress justification at the expense of sanctification, seeing justification as a goal, an end in itself, rather than as a means to holiness of life and communion with God." Mr George believes that the New Testament steers a course between these two opposite dangers. Its piety always stresses the personal relation between the believer and God. The synoptic tradition presents this is more "prophetic" terms: the otherness of God from man is given greater prominence. The Pauline and Johannine emphases on being "in Christ" or "abiding in Christ" bring those writers somewhat nearer to mysticism. But the essentially personal relation in which God has engaged man is never forgotten.

The main body of the book consists of a detailed examination of the New Testament evidence. The synoptic gospels, the primitive church, St Paul and the Johannine writings are discussed at length. Here we have some valuable exegetical work, pleasingly presented. Notable for its courage as well as its reverence and insight is Mr George's treatment of the prayers of Jesus: he traces the contribution of Jesus, not only in his teaching but also in his practice, to what prayer is. Gethsemane, for instance, is seen as the true type of all petitionary prayer: "prayer which begins with a wish and ends with surrender to the will of God is a creation of Jesus". Here too we come across some most illuminating comments on current theological controversy: Christology under the heading of "Jesus as man of prayer"; the late Bishop of Oxford's *The Vision of God* almost passim.

Where so much is given one is inclined and even perhaps entitled to ask for more. One wonders if the Old Testament background has been adequately exploited. There is less about the Hebrew conception of "corporate personality", or the strange oscillation between the one and the many which is so often under the surface in Hebrew thought, than one would have expected. Again, the epistle to the

Hebrews and the Revelation of St John the Divine are a little cursorily dismissed under "Other strands in New Testament thought". As Dr William Manson has recently been stressing, the epistle to the Hebrews has its own distinctive view of the norm of Christian faith, and this may be thought to have its implication for piety. And if the Apocalypse contains meditations not only *on* the End but also *from* the End by one who has proleptically entered into the last hour by participation in the eucharist, then might we not expect some illumination from it on the nature of our relation to our risen and glorified Lord, both now and then?

The answer to all this—one hopes—is that Mr George has not written his last word on this subject. When he writes more, perhaps he and other Biblical theologians would relate their exegesis not only to current theological controversies: the game of theologians answering their predecessors, or even their contemporaries, has a limited value for the edification of the Church. There is need also for exegesis which is made to illuminate the predicament of ordinary men who are trying to pray. It would, for instance, be interesting to hear Mr George discuss, from the New Testament, the problem of contemporary man-in-society who must be held in communion with God not only at self-conscious levels but also in those parts of his being which lie deeper than self-consciousness.

J. D. McCaughey.

Melbourne.

Chronicles of Little Gidding. By A. L. Maycock. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

At the end of his biography of Nicholas Ferrar (published in 1938) Mr Maycock remarks that "the story of Little Gidding does not end with the death of Nicholas . . . and a volume carrying on the present narrative . . . would be full of vivid interest". He has now himself produced this sequel, and it is perhaps inevitable that it should fail to sustain the interest of the earlier work. In attempting some account of the subsequent history of Little Gidding the author is obviously handicapped by the inadequacy both of his subject matter and of his sources.

The experiment in Christian community at Little Gidding derived its inspiration from its founder, Nicholas Ferrar, and depended principally upon him for its vitality and cohesion. It is unlikely that the community would have survived his premature death even had he left an obvious and capable successor. His elder brother John (husband of the recalcitrant Bathsheba) had been too devoted a subordinate of Nicholas to be his effective successor, even had he been spared the trials which the Commonwealth brought to a family whose active support of the Royalist cause was well known. In the circumstances the community disintegrated, and with it disappeared the only real material for carrying on the story of Little Gidding.

If the subject matter seems meagre, so also do the sources from

which the author has to draw his information about this stage of the fortunes of the family. The letters which survive in the Ferrar MSS at Magdalene College, Cambridge, are preoccupied with trivial matters, and fail to throw much light on the more important events of which we should really welcome an account. We are given, for example, a long and tedious excursus on the habits of silkworms, and many incidental details of a variety of business transactions in which members of the family were engaged. Yet no authoritative information is available about the circumstances of the spoliation of the church and the manor house by the Roundheads, or of the death of John Ferrar. (Nor are we told much more about Bathsheba—apart from the interesting intelligence that in spite of her discontent she survived most if not all of her contemporaries in the family!)

The Chronicles of Little Gidding is rather a collection of reminiscences than a piece of consecutive historical writing. Perhaps this is what Chronicles should be. If so it may perhaps be questioned whether they should be incorporated in a book of this kind. The inadequacy of the material which the author had at his disposal is reflected in the slenderness of a volume of 118 pages, which at 12s. 6d. must be considered expensive even in these days.

E. G. Knapp-Fisher.

Cuddesdon.

The S.P.C.K. and Wales, 1699–1740. By Mary Clement. S.P.C.K. 25s.

All who are interested in the history of the Church in Wales in the eighteenth century, and students in particular, are much indebted to Dr Mary Clement for adding this volume to her recently published *Correspondence and Minutes of the S.P.C.K. relating to Wales, 1699–1740,* upon which it is based. Her labours help to disclose the incalculable service rendered to Wales by the S.P.C.K. in the first half of that century, a service that has remained largely unrecognized and seldom acknowledged.

Few periods in church history have been so neglected as the eighteenth century, and this is particularly true of the Church in Wales. Not a few who have attempted the task have tended to dismiss it with contempt as if nothing good came out of it, and to say that its spiritual bankruptcy was relieved only by the Methodist Movement under John Wesley in England and its counterpart in Wales under Howell Harris. This view was fostered and became hardened in Wales as the result of the bitter prejudice engendered by the Disestablishment Controversy. But this is far from being the whole story. The picture of the Church at the opening of the century was indeed depressing enough, and history provides the reasons; but a revival was actually taking place that went far to revive and reform, even to the stirring of the dry bones into vibrant life, and this many years before Methodism touched Wales.

Dr Clement has done good service by helping to bring to light the

astonishing work accomplished by the S.P.C.K. in setting up charity schools in the Principality for the education of poor children, in providing religious and devotional literature in the Welsh tongue, and in establishing libraries to meet the needs of the clergy, so many of whom were too poverty-stricken to procure books. The Appendices are very informative; attention is drawn in these to the great Welsh patrons of education and religion, men like Sir John Philipps and many more whose noble contributions are so little known.

On p. 17 the author states that "by this date (1724) the founding of further S.P.C.K. Schools in Wales had almost ceased". While this may well be borne out by the Society's Minutes, it remains to be added that the School Movement continued vigorously in the dioceses, as for example in St Asaph Diocese, where close upon a hundred schools had been set up by 1750, the large majority established and maintained either by parochial or local efforts.

Dr Clement is surely right in rejecting other views and maintaining that Griffith Jones's Circulating Schools were "a means of making up for the failure of the Charity Schools". Griffith Jones had served a profitable apprenticeship as a Correspondent of the S.P.C.K. and the Society's Charity Schools, and when Sir John Philips died his mantle fell upon him. Realizing the weakness of the Charity Schools to be the general practice of using English as a medium of instruction when the vast majority of the children were monoglot Welsh, he embarked upon his system, using the vernacular as the medium. In this he applied the wide experience gained from the Society's charity schools and enjoyed the encouragement and support of the S.P.C.K. Welsh educationists have rightly paid tribute to the mighty work of Griffith Jones's Circulating Schools, but how seldom is it acknowledged that the pioneer work in education began with the S.P.C.K., the Society that was virtually the parent of the Circulating Schools!

On p. 16 the author cites the case of the Rev. John Price of Wrexham, as an instance among others of the clergy ejected "for their anti-Hanoverian views". It would be more correct to call these clergy "non-Jurors" rather than "anti-Hanoverian".

The Palace,
Abergwili.

William St Davids.

Thérèse of Lisieux: The Story of a Mission. By Hans Urs von Balthasar. Translated by Donald Nicholl. Sheed and Ward. 16s.

Although superficially the subject might seem foreign indeed to our insular and unsentimental tastes, this book is an important one which will interest not only the student of the infinitely various modes of sanctity, but all who are prepared to find spiritual and intellectual nourishment in a profound study of one of its most curious manifestations. Written by a distinguished Roman Catholic theologian, it is neither a biography nor a psychological study (critical remarks on such are included in the introduction and in the notes at the end of the volume) nor a moralizing running com-

mentary; the author calls it "an attempt at theological phenomenology", which, I take it, means in this context the application of theological principles to the phenomena presented by the life and particularly the mission of the saint. It is no panegyric, but is penetratingly and sometimes devastatingly critical. Human sanctity being essentially a paradox, and Thérèse's perhaps an extreme case, it is not surprising that the study itself is full of paradoxes. The structure of the book involves, moreover, some repetition, but only to present some new or deepened view of what has gone before.

After an introduction largely concerned with categories of sanctity, the work is divided into three main parts: The Essential, Vocation, and Doctrine. The first of these gives, as it were, the gist and outline of the work: Thérèse's passion for truth, her humility, the nature of her "little way", emphasizing her lack of book-reading (she proceeded from the *Imitation* to St John of the Cross and thence and chiefly to Holy Scripture, her perpetual nourishment, always seen in the light of her mission), her "existential" attitude, which means her constant need to relate truth communicated to her by grace with her own personal active experience (but is the fashionable term "existential" really necessary here?), and the difficulties and dangers put in her way before and after her entry into Carmel. All this and her teachings are developed in the other two parts, which include a shrewd study of her relationship to the mystical tradition. It is difficult to choose among the innumerable important problems and principles treated, but of particular interest are the author's interpretation of Thérèse's "little way" to perfection and the renunciations involved; her addition to her cognomen "of the Child Jesus" of that "of the Holy Face" and her synthesis of these apparently contradictory aspects of her passionate love for the Person of Jesus; the supreme paradox of the near-pride implicit in her consciousness of her own sanctity being transmuted into the most complete humiliation and self-abandonment; and, for non-Roman readers, the treatment, hardly perhaps completely successful, of the essential Catholicity of the saint's rejection of justification by works as against the Lutheran point of view. These are but a few of the riches in the treasure. It must be said that some of the subtler argumentation may seem typical of the modes of thought of post-Tridentine Roman spirituality; but there is never any lack of charity nor of ultimate reference to the real springs of Christian religious experience.

Materially, the book is agreeably presented, though the system adopted in the end-notes for reference to the text is awkward. The translation is smooth and fresh, but Thérèse's own verse has not always been perfectly rendered, though no great violence is done to the fundamental significance.[1]

University of Sheffield. H. W. Lawton.

[1] Page 232, end of note 2: *illuminera le martyr* means "will illumine the martyr", not "will radiate its martyrdom". Page 250, note 1: *abaisse ton glaive* means "lower your sword", not "put up your sword"; *De mon sang la source féconde / Purifiera tous mes élus* should be translated "The fertile spring of my blood shall purify all my chosen ones."

SHORTER NOTICES

THE TRAVAIL OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY. By Roland H. Bainton. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

"Write brief accounts of three of the following: Servetus, Castellio, Joris, Ochino, Roger Williams"—how many of us, faced by that question in an examination paper, would feel entirely happy? Yet there are figures, popularized by hagiography, who may be thought less significant than the nine men by means of short biographies by whom Professor Bainton here tells the story of the growth of religious toleration. Now indeed toleration, though it is a cause for which, as these pages show, much has been adventured, is not an exciting subject. To visit the birthplace of Locke (who, with the heterodox Milton, represents England among the nine) will quite fail to stir in us the generous emotions with which we view the hiding hole in the Jacobean manor house. This is a book for the head, more than for the heart, and not the least admirable of its qualities is that it sees the problems and dangers inherent in that which its theme is to commend. But it is never dull. It introduces the reader to much which is engaging—the illustrations are pre-eminently so—and the fascination increases, as the story advances, for the opening accounts of Torquemada and Calvin are too sketchy and the least successful. As a corrective to insularity this book will show from how many nations God has called his great eccentrics, and that it has not only been by English intransigence (with the Spanish Inquisition thrown in, because Drake did not like it) that the necessary tension between tolerance and intolerance has been preserved. The writer himself combines an eye for the picturesque and an erudition that carry us through the streets of ancient continental cities and the mazes of inquiring minds. Certainly the child of the travail is not one whose survival can be taken for granted, and it will be ungrateful not to know and to salute its midwives.

MAIDSTONE. FRANK BENNETT.

MEDITATION AND PIETY IN THE FAR EAST. By K. L. Reichelt. Lutterworth Press. 17s. 6d.

We are greatly indebted to Dr Holth for this English translation of another fascinating insight into Eastern thought by one of its greatest Western interpreters. The purpose of the book is given on p. 57. "A close study of the pulsating life of East Asia will convince anyone of the imperative necessity for the use of the same methods as those used by Paul in Athens. In the sanctuaries, cultures, literature, and everyday life of the Far East, the wide-awake missionary will catch glimpses of 'altars to the Unknown God'." While recognizing the dangers of syncretism and compromise, "it is equally certain that there is a great danger lest they neglect to make use of the Sacred Material which Christ through His Spirit has made available in the life of the peoples and in their historical heritage".

After reviewing the General Revelation revealed in the Eastern religions, and the place in them of yoga and meditation, Dr Reichelt gives us a masterly exposition of Original Taoism, before it became debased with alchemy and astrology. Lao Tzu expresses the strongest hope of immortality to be found in any Eastern religion. For him meditation was dynamic in the sense of Isaiah's "In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength". Confucius, starting from the conception of man's innate goodness, writes, "If man develops and expands his nature, he will gradually learn to understand this nature", and thus "to understand the nature of other people too. By such an understanding he shares the creative work of Heaven: indeed, he becomes a son of Heaven" (p. 122). For this understanding study and meditation are necessary, and also the translation of thought into action. Dr Reichelt attributes deeper religious content to the thought of Confucius than is recognized by other commentators. Subsequent developments of Confucianism are vividly traced. Moti in the fourth-century B.C. taught monotheism and mutual love —the "ai" of Christ rather than the "ren" or mere benevolence of Confucius. Had he had a worthy successor the religious history of China might have been quite different. Here is another of the great "ifs" of history.

No one who is interested in Eastern religions can afford to ignore this book.

LONDON. H. A. WITTENBACH.

CRY, THE BELOVED COUNTRY. A verse drama by Felicia Komai. Based on the novel by Alan Paton. Edinburgh House Press. 4s.

The sincerity and urgency of the message in this play transcend any consideration of its purely literary merit.

Briefly it is that the stark fear which possesses the African continent prevents the white minority from rendering justice to his African brother. This fear in the play results in a black man killing senselessly the greatest white champion of their race. Absalom Kumalo cannot explain why he kills Arthur Jarvis save "that he was afraid". The corruption of the uprooted blacks who leave their families and homes to earn starvation wages in the mines, and the plea for justice and humanity to the workers is feelingly portrayed. The Christian message is symbolically conveyed in the play by the forgiveness shown by the father of the murdered man (James Jarvis) to the father of the black who killed him (the Rev. Stephen Kumalo), because he understands at last the guilt of his own people in allowing the conditions of degradation in which their black brethren are allowed to live and for which poor, frightened Absalom suffers the death penalty. The dramatization is in every way worthy of this tremendous theme.

MARY GREW.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

AMERICAN CHURCH UNION: J. Loss and J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink (Ed.), *Reformation and Catholicity* (1s.).

BEREAN PRESS: James Gray, *Essentials for a Living Church* (3s. 6d.).

BURNS OATES: P. F. Anson, *Christ and the Sailor* (13s. 6d.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: Marcus L. Loane, *Masters of the English Reformation* (12s. 6d.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: Robert Woodifield, *Catholicism: Humanist and Democratic* (5s.).

DESCLÉE ET CIE: Raymond Vancourt, *La phénoménologie et la foi* (n.p.).

DOUBLEDAY (NEW YORK): Reinhold Niebuhr and others, *Religion and Freedom of Thought* (n.p.).

FABER AND FABER: Daniel Jenkins, *Congregationalism: A Restatement* (10s. 6d.).

VAN GORCUM AND COMP.: G. J. van de Poll, *Martin Bucer's Liturgical Ideas* (Fl. 9.50 in paper; 10.90 in cloth).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Gary MacEoin, *Nothing is Quite Enough* (12s. 6d.); A. P. Shepherd, *A Scientist of the Invisible* (12s. 6d.); Alphonse Maeder, *Ways to Psychic Health* (12s. 6d.); Francesca French, *Miss Brown's Hospital* (3s. 6d.); H. A. Guy, *The Origin of the Gospel of Mark* (10s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: John Ferguson (Ed.), *Studies in Christian Social Commitment* (8s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Hilda C. Graef (Trans.), *St Gregory of Nyssa: The Lord's Prayer; The Beatitudes* [No. 18 in the series of Ancient Christian Writers] (25s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Cosslett Quin, *At the Lord's Table* (18s.).

MACMILLAN: Vincent Taylor, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus* (12s. 6d.).

OMEGA PRESS: Sherwood Eddy, *You will Survive Death* (12s. 6d.).

HERBERT REICH (EVANGELISCHER VERLAG): Hans-Werner Bartsch, *Der gegenwärtige Stand der Entmythologisierungsdebatte* (DM. 4.80); Hans-Werner Bartsch (Ed.), *Kerygma und Mythos*, Vol. III (DM. 6.00); Peter Dalbert, *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missions-Literatur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus* (DM. 9.80); Gerhard Gloege, *Offenbarung und Überlieferung* (DM. 3.60).

REVUE "THÉOLOGIE" ARCHEVÊCHÉ (ATHENS): *Θεολογία* (April–June 1954) ($6.00 per annum).

ROCKLIFF: Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R., *Studies in Literature and Belief* (15s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Evanston Surveys: (1) *Faith and Order : our oneness in Christ and our disunity as Churches;* (2) *Evangelism: the Mission of the Church to those outside her life;* (3) *Social Questions: the Responsible Society in a world perspective;* (4) *International Affairs: Christians in the struggle for world community;* (5) *Intergroup Relations: the Church amid racial and ethnic tensions;* (6) *The Laity: the Christian in his vocation* (2s. 6d. each); Thomas Price, *African Marriage* (2s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: *The Chronicle of Canterbury Convocation, Sessions of May, 1954* (3s.); R. C. D. Jasper, *Prayer Book Revision in England 1800–1900* (13s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: A. M. Stibbs, *The Finished Work of Christ* (1s. 6d.).

EMMANUEL VITTE (LYON): *Paul Couturier, apôtre de l'unité chrétienne* (480 frs).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON